



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,881	04/25/2001	Jae Kyung Lee	P-219	4938
34610	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP			BELIVEAU, SCOTT E	
P.O. BOX 221200			ART UNIT	
CHANTILLY, VA 20153			PAPER NUMBER	
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/840,881

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Beliveau

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 13 April 2005. These drawings are approved.

Response to Arguments

2. The OFFICIAL NOTICE presented stating that it is notoriously well known in the Internet art so as to utilize URLs in order to access Internet pages was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of fact.
3. The OFFICIAL NOTICE presented as to the equivalence of a "URL" and "Internet page address" for their use in the Internet art as means for accessing a Internet page and the particular selection of either as having been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of fact.
4. The OFFICIAL NOTICE stating that it is notoriously well known in the art for user manuals to comprise information detailing "special functions" associated with the particular device was not traversed and is accordingly taken as an admission of fact.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 15-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill

at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In the instant case, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses a species of TV or PC-TV with an "on-line" help feature that is operable to connect to the Internet and is further described as including an optical scanner. The reference is silent as to where the "on-line" help feature is derived. The Sturgeon et al. reference is knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made as it was filed ~3 years prior to applicant's priority date. The VanRyzin reference discloses a PC with an optical scanner that is operable to retrieve an on-line manual from the Internet. The VanRyzin reference is knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made as it was filed ~1.5 years prior to applicant's priority date. Similarly, the Lee reference discloses a technique for retrieving help-manuals from the Internet through a PC. The Lee reference is also knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made as it was filed ~1.5 years prior to applicant's priority date. Accordingly, the particular usage of a PC-TV to implement known PC functionality was clearly knowledge that was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made. Therefore, any rejection derived therefrom takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying

Art Unit: 2614

the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as set forth in the grounds of rejection, the motivation to combine the references so as to implement PC functionality using a specialized type of PC is explicitly set forth in the references of record.

With respect to applicant's arguments pertaining to the "alleged inherency" of storing "proper information of a product" or "stored contact information", it is noted that once a reference teaching a product appearing to be substantially identical is made the basis of a rejection and the examiner presents evidence or reasoning tending to show inherency, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference. "[T]he PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his [or her] claimed product. Whether the rejection is based on inherency' under 35 U.S.C. 102, on prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same...[footnote omitted]." *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980) (quoting *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-34 (CCPA 1977)). Applicant's arguments that the combination of references fail to teach "storage" is unsupported by any evidence which would counter the examiner's reasoning towards inherency. How can Lee operate such that the client retrieves requested information from the remote server [110] without having stored the address of the server for which the information is to be requested from? How does Lee operate so as to retrieve

Art Unit: 2614

information pertaining to a particular product name/model from an Internet site without the product name/model associated with the request having been stored and subsequently communicated to the remote server [110]? As no objective evidence has been provided, applicant's arguments cannot be deemed persuasive.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 20 is objected to because of the phrase “displaying the received information of a screen of the television system” should read “displaying the received information on a screen of the television system” in order to be consistent with the supporting disclosure of the specification and earlier claim recitations . Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 20, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kikinis (US Pat No. 5,929,849).

In consideration of claim 20, the Kikinis reference discloses a method wherein the system “receives a signal indicating a desire to obtain product-related information” [10], the system subsequently “transmits previously-stored identifying information of a product to a server in

Art Unit: 2614

direct response to the received signal” [103/107], “receives information at a television system” [11] from the “server” [54] “based on the transmitted previously-stored identifying information” and “displays the received information on a screen of the television system” [51] (Col 6, Line 50 – Col 8 Line 44; Col 8, Line 65 – Col 9, Line 3; Col 9, Line 24 – Col 10, Line 18).

Claim 23 and 24 are rejected wherein “transmitting previously-stored identifying information comprises transmitting the previously-stored identifying information based on previously-stored contact information of a website” wherein the “contact information is a URL” (Kikinis: Col 6, Lines 50-63; Col 9, Lines 28-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2614

11. Claims 1-13 and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (US Pat No. 5,929,849) in view of the “BMW™ website” as retrieved from the InternetWayback Machine.

In consideration of claim 1, the Kikinis reference discloses an “apparatus” or “TV” [11/51] for “reproducing video and audio signals by receiving a broadcast signal” [15/16/17/28]. The “TV” [11/51] comprises a “storing unit” [49] for “storing proper information of a product and contact information of an Internet site” [59] (Figure 3A: Col 6, Line 50 – Col 7, Line 23; Col 9, Lines 28-35) and a “controlling unit” [19] to “access information from the Internet site using the stored proper information in response to an action of a user” and “further displaying . . . information of the product on a screen” [51] (Figure 2C) by using the “stored contact information and the stored proper information” corresponding to the particular model of interest (Col 7, Lines 48 – Col 8, Line 37). The reference discloses that the retrieved BMW™ web page may comprise a plurality of information pertaining to the particular model of vehicle, but it does not particularly disclose that the page comprises “function information and feature information” relating to the particular car.

In a related art, the “BMW™ website” printouts provide evidence that the “BMW website” comprises “function information and feature information” pertaining to at least one model such as the “Z3”. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to include “function information and feature information” in connection with the advertised car for the purpose of providing the user with the maximum information about products of interest seen in TV transmissions.

Claim 2 is rejected wherein the “Internet site is a product-related site” (www.bmw.com) associated with BMW™ (Kikinis: Col 7, Line 57 – Col 8, Line 22).

Claim 3 is rejected wherein the “function information and feature information of the product is provided from a product-related site server” [54] associated with the manufacturer or BMW™ (Kikinis: Col 7, Line 57 – Col 8, Line 22).

Claim 4 is rejected wherein the “controller unit transmits the proper information of the product to a product-related site server” [54] which hosts the BMW™ website (Kikinis: Col 7, Line 57 – Col 8, Line 22)..

Claim 5 is rejected wherein the “proper information is provided to a product-related site server” [54] through a “network interface” [35/39].

Claim 6 is rejected wherein the “proper information of the product is a model name or model number” such as that associated with the particular model of car of interest (ex. Z3) (Kikinis: Col 7, Lines 10-17).

Claim 7 is rejected wherein the “contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” (Kikinis: Col 6, Lines 50-63).

Claim 8 is rejected wherein the “function information” is “information corresponding to video or audio-related functions” associated with the car-stereo equipment.

Claim 9 is rejected wherein the “feature information is information corresponding to a special function” such as the ability for the car windows to raise/lower with one-touch.

Claim 10 is rejected as aforementioned wherein the Kikinis reference discloses a “control method of a TV” [11/51]. In particular, “when a selection is made by a user” [95], the system “transmits stored proper information of a product from the TV to a product-related

site” [54] by “using stored contact information of the product-related site stored in advance” and “displays the selected information on a screen of the TV” [51] (Kikinis: Col 6, Line 50 – Col 8 Line 44; Col 8, Line 65 – Col 9, Line 3; Col 9, Line 24 – Col 10, Line 18). The reference discloses that the retrieved BMW™ web page may comprise a plurality of information pertaining to the particular model of vehicle, but it does not particularly disclose that the page comprises “menu information corresponding to the product” such that the system further “receives information selected by the user in the menu information” relating to the particular car.

In a related art, the “BMW™ website” printouts provide evidence that the “BMW website” comprises “menu information corresponding to the product” such that the system can “receive information selected by the user in the menu information” pertaining to at least one model such as the “Z3” (ex. Standard and Optional Features, Retailers Centers, Technical Specifications, etc.). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to include “menu information corresponding to the product” which the user can subsequently “select” in connection with the advertised car for the purpose of providing the user with the maximum information about products of interest seen in TV transmissions.

Claim 11 is rejected wherein the “proper information of the product is a model name or model number” such as that associated with the particular model of car of interest (ex. Z3) (Kikinis: Col 7, Lines 10-17).

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected wherein the “proper information” is “transmitted by using the contact information of the product-related site” (ex. www.bmwusa.com/machine/z3/ . . .)

and the “contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” (Kikinis: Col 6, Lines 50-63).

Claim 15 is rejected wherein the “menu information is information corresponding to video or audio-related functions, and information corresponding to a special function” of the particular model of the vehicle.

Claim 16 is rejected wherein “transmitting the stored proper information occurs when a function selection key signal is inputted by the user” (Kikinis: Col 7, Lines 57-60).

Claim 17 is rejected wherein the “control method further comprises receiving and processing a broadcast signal when the function selection key is not inputted” such that the TV merely operates as a normal television displaying the received broadcast information (Kikinis: Col 8, Lines 1-22).

Claim 18 is rejected wherein the “control method further comprises displaying general home page information on the screen after receiving it when the proper information is not transmitted to the product-related site”. For example, the “proper information” specifying a particular model number is not included as part of the contact information the system goes to the BMW™ homepage (Kikinis: Col 6, Line 64 – Col 7, Line 9).

Claim 19 is rejected wherein the “action of the user comprises pressing of a selection key” [67].

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected in light of the aforementioned combination of references wherein the Kikinis reference explicitly suggests the usage of the BMW™ webpage and the usage of a car model. As previously set forth in light of the usage of the evidenced actual BMW™ webpage, it would have been obvious that the “previously-stored identifying

information comprises a model name” or a “model number stored prior to receiving the signal” for the purpose of providing a quick link to the specific product being advertised and of interest. For example, “Z3” comprises both the model name “Z3” and the model number “3”.

Claim 25 is rejected in light of the aforementioned combination of references wherein the system “receives menu information form the website in response to the transmitted previously-stored identifying information” allowing the user to select from a plurality of options associated with the particular model of BMW™ advertised as evidence by the BMW™ website printouts.

Claim 26 is rejected in light of the aforementioned combination of references wherein the “menu information is information corresponding to video or audio-related functions, and information corresponding to a special function” of the particular model of the vehicle.

12. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon et al. (US Pat No. 6,202,212) in view of Van Ryzin (US Pub No. 2002/0059241).

In consideration of claim 1, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses an “apparatus” or species of “TV” [82] with an optical scanner. The “apparatus” is operable to “reproduce video and audio signals by receiving a broadcast signal” comprising a “storing unit” [104/106/114/116/112] and a “controlling unit” [102] which “accesses information from [an] Internet site” (Col 5, Line 59 – Col 6, Line 25). The reference however, does not explicitly disclose nor preclude the usage of the PC functionality for the particular retrieval of product related information from the Internet.

The Van Ryzin reference discloses a technique whereby a PC is operable to “store proper information of a product” comprising a UPC or other equivalent code and “contact information of an Internet site” [30] whereupon a “controlling unit” responsible for executing client software resident on the associated PC [10] “accesses information from the Internet site using the stored proper information in response to an action of a user” or the scanning of a product bar code (Para. [0022]). The apparatus further “displays function information and feature information of the product” associated with an on-line user manual “on a screen” [10B] by “using the stored contact information and the stored proper information” to retrieve and access the displayed information (Figure 3; Para. [0029] – [0034]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the apparatus of Sturgeon et al. to apply the method of Van Ryzin for the purpose of advantageously providing a means for quickly linking to a desired web page for a user manual or other information for products (Van Ryzin: Para. [0006]).

Claim 2 is rejected wherein the “Internet site is a product-related site” in so far as it, relates the product to the particular manufacture web-site or is the manufacturer of the product.

Claim 3 is rejected wherein the “function information and feature information of the product is provided from a product-related site server” associated with the manufacturer.

Claim 4 is rejected wherein the “controller unit transmits the proper information of the product to a product-related site server” [30] which subsequently performs the appropriate look-up function.

Claim 5 is rejected wherein the “proper information is provided to a product-related site server” [30] through a “network interface” [152].

Claim 6 is rejected wherein the “proper information of the product is a model name or model number” as a UPC serves as a model number assigned by the manufacturer (see Rothschild: Col 1, Lines 30-41 regarding the composition of a UPC).

In consideration of claim 7, the reference discloses that the server resides at a known internet address (Para. [0032]). The reference, however, does not explicitly state that the “contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)”. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE as to the equivalence of an internet address and a “URL” for their use in the Internet art as means for accessing Internet resources and that the selection of any of these known equivalents to access a Internet resource would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

In consideration of claim 8, the “function information” is “information corresponding to video or audio-related functions” when the on-line user manual is related to audio/video equipment (Para. [0020]).

In consideration of claim 9, while the combined teachings disclose that the user is provided with on-line user guide corresponding to the requested product. Applicant’s admission of fact provides evidence that it is notoriously well known in the art for user manuals to comprise information detailing “special functions” associated with the particular device. For example, a special function corresponding to a PVR might be that corresponding to pause functionality. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to provide information in the user guide

Art Unit: 2614

detailing “special functions” for the purpose advantageously explaining to the user the operation and functionality of the interconnected device.

13. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon et al. (US Pat No. 6,202,212), in view of Van Ryzin (US Pub No. 2002/0059241), and in further view of Boles et al. (US Pat No. 5,212,371).

In consideration of claim 19, the Van Ryzin reference suggests the particular usage of any form of equivalent optical bar code scanner (Para. [002]), but is silent with respect to “the action of the user comprises pressing of a selection key” in connection with the scanning of the bar code. In a related art pertaining to bar code readers, the Boles et al. reference discloses a bar code reader comprising a “selection key” [20]. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the Boles et al. bar code scanner in connection with Van Ryzin for the purpose of utilizing an equivalent bar code reader which further advantageously with an improved means for aiming the scan beam (Boles et al.: Col 1, Lines 5-8).

14. Claims 10-13, 15-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon et al. (US Pat No. 6,202,212) in view of Lee (US Pat No. 6,542,897).

In consideration of claim 10, as aforementioned, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses a “TV” [82] species or PC-TV that facilitates a plurality of functional modes associated with a plurality of consumer electronic devices including modes that facilitate Internet access. While the reference suggests the particular usage of an on-line help manual, the reference does not explicitly disclose nor preclude the particular usage scenarios as claimed.

The Lee reference discloses a method for providing customer support improving upon traditional on-line manuals by using the Internet. "When a selection is made by a user" to contact the customer support server for information pertaining to a particular model of consumer electronics device, the apparatus "transmits stored proper information of a product . . . to a product-related certain site" [110] by using inherently stored contact information of the product-related site stored in advance. The "contact information" of the product-related site must be stored in advance in order for the apparatus connecting through the Internet to access/contact the remote server in order to retrieve product information (ex. How would the apparatus connect to the remote server in response to the user's request without the address of the remote server having already been stored?). Similarly, the "proper information" must also be stored or else the product-related site [110] would not know what product information is being requested. The apparatus subsequently "receives menu information corresponding to the product" (Figure 13), "receives information selected by a user in the menu information" (Figure 14), and "displays the selected information on a screen" (Figure 15). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the Sturgeon et al. apparatus using the teachings of Lee for the purpose of providing an improved customer service system using the Internet to ensure a high level of customer satisfaction and minimize after-service cost for a computer system and other consumer electronics devices (Lee: Col 1, Line 48 – Col 2, Line 14).

Claim 11 is rejected wherein the "proper information is a model name or a model number of the product" (Lee: Col 5, Lines 11-22).

Claim 12 is rejected wherein the “proper information is transmitted by using the contact information of the product-related site” associated with the Internet based support server.

For example, the user must utilize “contact information” in order to access the homepage of the support server [110].

In consideration of claim 13, the references do not explicitly disclose nor preclude that the “contact information is a URL (Universal Resource Locator)”. Applicant’s admission of fact provides evidence that it is notoriously well known in the Internet art so as to utilize URLs in order to access Internet pages. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a “URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” as a means of “contact information” for the inherent advantages associated with such including the ability to utilize an easily remembered address name which further allows the customer service provider to advantageously change IP addresses, if necessary.

Claim 15 is rejected wherein “the menu information is information corresponding to video or audio-related functions” (ex. CD-ROM Drive) and “information corresponding to a special function” such as those pertaining to the support of a infra-red communication. The claims are not limiting with respect to what is meant by a "special function" of a consumer electronic device.

In consideration of claims 16 and 17, the apparatus “transmits the stored proper information” “when a function selection key signal is inputted by the user” designating the PC-TV to operate in PC mode and the “control method further comprises receiving and

processing a broadcast signal when the function selection key signal is not inputted”

(Sturgeon et al.: Figures 11-12).

In consideration of claim 18, the Lee reference discloses that the system initially displays a “general homepage information on the screen after receiving it when the proper information is not transmitted to the product-related site” [300] (Lee: Col 5, Lines 1-11).

Claim 20 is rejected as previously set forth. The Sturgeon et al. reference discloses a “television system” [82] that is operable to access the Internet, to “receive a signal indicating a desire to obtain product-related information” associated with product related help and to “display . . . received information [on] a screen of the television system”. While the reference suggests the particular usage of an on-line help manual, the reference does not explicitly disclose nor preclude the particular usage scenarios as claimed.

The Lee reference discloses a method for providing customer support that improves upon traditional on-line manuals by using the Internet. The method comprises “receiving a signal indicating a desire to obtain product-related information”, “transmitting . . . identifying information of a product to a server in direct response to the received signal” (Figures 6, 10, and 13), “receiving information . . . from the server” [110] “based on the transmitted . . . identifying information” (Figures 7, 8, 11, and 14-15), and subsequently “displaying the received information” as illustrated. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize the Sturgeon et al. apparatus using the teachings of Lee for the purpose of providing an improved customer service system using the Internet to ensure a high level of customer satisfaction and minimize

Art Unit: 2614

after-service cost for a computer system and other consumer electronics devices (Lee: Col 1, Line 48 – Col 2, Line 14).

As previously set forth, the Lee system inherently stores the "identifying information of a product" in association with the user's request for information pertaining to that particular product. For example, the "identifying information of a product" must be stored in order to be displayed on the screen and must be stored in order to formulate a request for the subsequent information. Accordingly, the particular limitations such that the information has been "previously stored" as set forth in the claim limitation are met for the scenario wherein the user repeats the aforementioned method steps for the purpose of retrieving the same information at a later date in order to resolve reoccurring problems or in order to refresh the operators memory as to how a particular function works. The "identifying information of a product" would be "previously-stored" for a later execution of the method.

Claim 21 and 22 are rejected wherein the "previously-stored identifying information comprises a model name" or a "model number stored prior to receiving the signal" (Lee: Col 5, Lines 11-22).

Claim 23 is rejected wherein the "transmitting previously-stored identifying information comprises transmitting the previously-stored identifying information based on previously-stored contact information of a web-site" associated with the support server [110].

In consideration of claim 24, the references do not explicitly disclose nor preclude that the "contact information comprises URL (Universal Resource Locator)". Applicant's admission of fact provides evidence that it is notoriously well known in the Internet art so as to utilize URLs in order to access Internet pages. Accordingly, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a "URL (Uniform Resource Locator)" as a means of "contact information" for the inherent advantages associated with such including the ability to utilize an easily remembered address name which further allows the customer service provider to advantageously change IP addresses, if necessary.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected wherein the method "further comprises receiving menu information from the website in response to the transmitted previously-stored identifying information" (Figure 7) wherein "the menu information comprises information corresponding to video or audio-related functions" (ex. CD-ROM Drive) and "information corresponding to a special function" such as those pertaining to the support of a infra-red communication. The claims are not limiting with respect to what is meant by a "special function" of a consumer electronic device.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Narayan et al. (US Pat No. 6,859,937) reference discloses a system and method for obtaining contextual help for a networked television.

Art Unit: 2614

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 571-272-7343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access

Art Unit: 2614

to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197
(toll-free).

SEB

June 21, 2005



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600